2:Sanders E-5 (no date) 1949 EE1 Bulgaria EE1

178 606 596 A daughter-in-law especially disliked to live as a stranger in her husband's paternal home subject to the will of the parents-in-law. Time and time again I heard this opinion clumsily but definitely expressed:

"The large families started to break up after the wars. The chief reason for that was the daughter-in-law. Many of them come from different places and even if they come from the same village, they begin to care more for their own children and to make things for them without the knowledge of the others with whom they are living. This brings trouble among them and so they quarrel. Then they talk to their husbands; finally the brothers, although they love one another, have to separate in order to be at peace."

178 596 Ordinarily most men felt that conditions were better before the separation, though the women were more content apart. Ill will and distrust also grew up between the members of the family when some of them who worked as day laborers failed to hand over their entire earnings to the common treasury. In the villages around Sofia several brothers rarely lived together with undivided possessions after the death of their father as they would have done in the days of the zadruga. During 1935, a record year for the division of families in Dragalevtsy, there were 9 cases of estates being broken up, 3 of them the result of the separation of son and father and the remaining 6 involving the separation of brothers. When a large family divided, the younger brother usually remained in the old homestead and assumed the care of the parents.

● 594 178 551 This change from the large patriarchal family to the small conjugal family was having consequences which few of the peasants realized.[1] For one thing, in comparison with the larger group, the conjugal family, which consists of parents and their unmarried children, has a short life. It ends, in a sense, with the death of one of the marriage partners. This especially affects the rearing of children, who in the olden days grew up with such a bevy of cousins that a special middle name was useful in identifying each child with his particular parents. More specifically each child received a "small" or given name selected by his godparents; as a middle name he automatically added to his father's given name an *ev* or *ov* ("the son of") or, if a girl, an *eva* or *ova* ("the daughter of"). As a last name he

[1] [Cf. pp. 65-69, category 116--Analyst]

551 would take the larger family name of his father's kinship group. Thus
178 an outsider could immediately place each child not only in the family
● 594 group as a whole but in the small conjugal group as well. Students of child development have often pointed out the advantage to the child of growing up with a number of intimate contemporaries, as well as having several adults ready to serve as substitute parents whenever occasion demands.

But the change need not be viewed as entirely unfavorable. The smaller family unit was bringing about a more intimate relationship between members, breaking down the formalism between parents and children, and encouraging democratic living.

178 The good old days, if we are to believe the elders of the village,
463 differed not only in the degree of governmental autonomy in community affairs and a patriarchy in which the young respected the old: occupations too were of a different order.

"Half a century ago there were very few educated people, the chief of these being a priest from the monastery and a teacher. The mayor was an ordinary peasant elected by the town council of twelve people. There was a swineherd, as well as other herdsmen, and five merchants, plus a tanner. Practically all of the people were farmers. There was no dairyman; there was no doctor. All dentistry was done by Turks who remedied an aching tooth by pulling it out. We raised no horses, and an itinerant gypsy smith did all the necessary iron work."

When I asked another man about occupations half a century ago, he added this information:

"It was 'simple business' fifty years ago. There was a teacher for boys in the first and second grades; there was no village tailor, and the single tanner had little work. A priest from the monastery min-
652 istered to the people on occasion. We had no tax collector and an
211 illiterate mayor took all the taxes and kept the account on a *rabosh*."

(Here I steered the conversation off the subject of occupations long enough to find out what the *rabosh* was. It was similar to a practice of the Exchequer in twelfth-century England in which accounting was done with pieces of notched wood. Each family had a small piece of wood fitting into another piece kept by the mayor. The notches in the wood told the financial status of the family as far as the tax money was concerned.)

2:Sanders E-5 (no date) 1949 EEl Bulgaria EEl

●594

"The mayor [with his family] was the spearhead in the attack on the old ways." *See page 163.*

291

"Trayko Danev . . . one of the richest peasants in the village." *See page 164.*

[facing p. 101]